



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,439	07/26/2006	Todd A. Eckert	17303-62825	5580
35973	7590	11/18/2008	EXAMINER	
BINGHAM MCHALE LLP			SINGH, KAVEL	
2700 MARKET TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
10 WEST MARKET STREET			3651	
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-4900				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/18/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptodocket@binghammchale.com
schantz@binghammchale.com
pbailey@binghammchale.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/549,439	Applicant(s) ECKERT ET AL.
	Examiner KAVEL P. SINGH	Art Unit 3651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 41-44 and 56-67 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 41-44, and 56-67 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No./Mail Date 9/04/07

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No./Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/03/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

The 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection to claim 45 has been withdrawn. Applicant's arguments filed 9/04/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 41, Applicant argues that Frank does not teach slippable rollers, but according to the definition of slippable (to move to cause to move smoothly from Webster's II Dictionary and the broadest interpretation), the rollers (24,25) as taught by Frank teaches conveyor rolls to rotate the selected series of conveyor rolls (C3 L5-10). Franks teaches the conveyor rolls 24 are driven together by driving chain 31 which is on the outer diameter of the roller 24.

For the foregoing reasons claims 41-45 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3651

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 41-43 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frank U.S. Patent No. 3,992,182.

Claim 41, Frank teaches a first section of roller shafts (24), each said shaft (24) of said first section driving a plurality of rollers slippable on the outer diameter of the corresponding said shaft (24) (C4 L23-25), a first portion of the first section driving rollers (24) which slip on the corresponding said shaft at a first predetermined torque, a second portion of the first section driving rollers (25) which slip of the corresponding said shaft at a second predetermined torque, the second torque being greater than the first torque; and a second section of roller shafts, each said shaft of said second section driving at least one roller fixed to a corresponding shaft of the second section (25), the second section (25) adapted and configured for receiving products conveyed from the first section (Fig. 1).

Claims 42 and 43, Frank teaches the portion of the first section (24) has a length that is less than about the length of the product (C8 L20-25).

Claim 67, Frank teaches a first driving chain (31) placed along a side of the conveying path and parallel to the conveying path (Fig. 3a), said first chain (31) driving said first portion of said first section (24); a second driving chain (131) placed along a side of the conveying path and parallel to the conveying path (25), at least a portion of the length of said second driving chain (131) overlapping at least a portion of said first driving chain (31) (Fig. 3a) said second chain driving (131) said second portion of said first section (24); and wherein at least one said roller shaft (24) of said first section has two ends

and a driving wheel proximate to one end of said shaft (24); and said conveyor is adapted and configured to rotatably support said one roller shaft such that said driving wheel is capable of engaging said first chain (31) along the overlapping portion of the length and driving said one roller shaft (24), and said conveyor is adapted and configured to rotatably support said one roller shaft (24) such that said driving wheel is capable of engaging said second chain along the overlapping portion of the length and driving said one roller shaft (24) (C4 L24-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank U.S.

Patent No. 3,992,182 in view of Jabbusch U.S. Patent No. 3,894,627.

Claim 44, Frank teaches an infeed conveyor receiving conveyed products from the second section, but not as Jabbusch teaches providing the products to the product wrapper (C2 L9-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a wrapper section as taught by Jabbusch into the invention of Frank to provide an additional working station and allow easy packaging for any article being transferred.

Art Unit: 3651

Claim 56,57,58, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank U.S. Patent No. 3,992,182 in view of Jabbusch U.S. Patent No. 3,894,627 in further view of Wielebski U.S. Patent 6,522,944.

Claim 56, Wielebski teaches an electronic controller (48) in order for controlling the speed of the second section (25) of Frank; and Frank teaches a sensor (38) providing to the controller a signal corresponding to the position of the conveying surface (C4 L65-67) of the infeed conveyor (22) as taught by Jabbusch; Wielebski teaches wherein said controller (48) for the controls the speed of the second section in response to the signal as taught by Frank. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a controller as taught by Wielebski into the invention of Frank to be able to transfer the articles with control and logic.

Claim 57, Frank teaches a first means (30) for driving the first portion (24), a second means (130) for driving the second portion (25), Wielebski teaches a third means (131) for driving the second section (C4 L30-35), and an electronic controller (271,272,273) operatively coupled to the first driving means (30), the second driving means (130) and the third means (131) of Frank. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a controller as taught by Wielebski into the invention of Frank to be able to transfer the articles with control and logic

Claims 58 and 63, Wielebski teaches the controller (48) into Frank who operates the second portion (25) and the second section (25) at substantially the same speed. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a controller to operate the

conveyor at substantially the same speed as taught by Wielebski into the invention of Frank in order to transition the article from section to section.

Claims 59-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank U.S. Patent No. 3,992,182 in view of Albrecht U.S. Patent No. 3,391,520.

Claim 59, Frank does not teach as Albrecht teaches means for stopping (80) a product on (C7 L9-11) said second portion of said first section of Frank. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a stop block as taught by Albrecht into the invention of Frank in order to allow easy transitions from section to section.

Claim 60, Frank does not teach as Albrecht teaches said stopping means (80) is a product stop that blocks products on the conveyor (C7 L9-11). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a stop block as taught by Albrecht into the invention of Frank in order to allow easy transitions from section to section.

Claim 61, Frank does not teach as Albrecht teaches said stopping means includes a brake (120) for rollers (118) for stopping rotation of a plurality of slippable rollers (C9 L12-15). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a brake mechanism as taught by Albrecht into the invention of Frank in order to allow products to maintain order during conveyance.

Claim 62, Frank does not teach as Albrecht teaches said stopping means (83) includes pressing on the product from above (Fig. 13). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a stop from above as taught by Albrecht into the invention of Frank in order to allow products to maintain order during conveyance.

Claims 64 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank U.S. Patent No. 3,992,182 in view of Teramoto U.S. Patent No. 6,454,079.

Claims 64 and 65, Frank does not teach as Teramoto teaches the conveying speed of the first portion is greater than the conveying speed of the second portion and less than the conveying speed of said first section (Fig. 3 Constant speed is section one and decelerating section if section 2). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a conveying speed greater in the first portion than the second as taught by Teramoto in order to allow ease into the wrapping section.

Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank U.S. Patent No. 3,992,182 in view of Jabbusch U.S. Patent No. 3,894,627 in further view of Wielebski U.S. Patent 6,522,944 in further view of Albrecht U.S. Patent No. 3,391,520.

Claim 66, Frank does not teach as Albrecht teaches an infeed conveyor (11) and a product wrapper (15,23), said infeed conveyor (11) receiving product from said second section (of Frank); wherein said electronic controller (included in 11 of Albrecht) adjusts said second driving means (130 of Wielebski) relative to said third driving means (131 of Wielebski so as to change the spacing between adjacent products being provided to said infeed conveyor (11).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Kavel P. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-2362. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

Art Unit: 3651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Crawford can be reached on (571) 272-6911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KPS

/Gene Crawford/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3651